



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/035,833      | 12/27/2001  | Yusuke Nakamura      | FORS-06904          | 2659             |

7590 12/28/2004

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
440 Science Drive Suite 203  
Madison, WI 53711

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SITTON, JEHANNE SOUAYA

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1634

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,833

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Jehanne S Sitton

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22,37-41 and 76-110 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22,37-41 and 76-110 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1634

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-22, 37-41 and 76-110, drawn to SEQ ID NOS: 7063, 7064, 7071, 7073 and 7074 in the reply filed on 10/14/2004 is acknowledged. Claims 23-36, 42-75 and 111-123, and all nonelected SEQ ID NOS have been canceled. It is noted that the election of SEQ ID NOS was not argued or indicated as an election with traverse. Accordingly, such election has been treated as an election without traverse.

### ***Priority***

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on 5 applications filed in Japan on various dates between 12/27/2000 and 12/27/2001. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of any such applications as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b), nor have any translated copies been filed. It is noted that a submission on 10/30/2002 was made which appears to include sequences from application Japan 2001:256,862 8/27/2001, however the submission does not appear to be a certified copy of the document, nor does the submission appear to provide support for any of the instantly recited SEQ ID NOS. As such, the claims have been awarded the priority date of the instantly filed specification.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following:

Art Unit: 1634

A) The drawings contain sequences that are not identified by a sequence identifier.

Chapter 2400 of the MPEP requires that all iterations of nucleic acid sequences of 10 or more nucleotides be designated by a proper sequence identifier.

B) There are 743 pages of drawings, however the "Brief Description of the Drawings" only references Figures 1-313. More pages of drawings exist which have not been identified by any figure legend or figure number. Such pages contain tables of information that cannot be discerned, as well as SNP information which have no explanation. It is further noted, that due to the fact that no numbering system was provided for these 743 pages, they appear out of order, or in no particular order, and SNP information is interspersed with table information. Accordingly, their relevance to the instantly pending claims cannot be assessed.

C) Pages 2, 48, 105, 124, and 178 of the specification are missing. In their place, the specification contains duplicates of pages 157, 138, 191, 188, and 221, respectively. It is further noted, that the new application transmittal asserts that 263 pages of specification were submitted, but there are only 236 pages of specification for this application with the omissions and substitutions as set forth above. Additionally, it should be noted that no other omissions appear to be present other than the pages indicated, and that therefore the designation of the 263 pages appears to be an error.

D) There are only 743 pages of drawings, however the new application transmittal asserts that there are 745 pages.

E) There are only 705 pages of sequence listing submitted with the application as filed. The sequence listing states that there are 4309 sequences. All appear to be present as the

Art Unit: 1634

sequence listing ends with SEQ ID NO: 4309, however the new application transmittal indicates that 1687 pages of sequence listing were filed, which indication appears to be in error.

Appropriate correction is required, however applicants should take care not to add new matter into the disclosure.

***New Matter***

4. The sequence listing filed 10/30/2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: As stated above, only 705 pages of Sequence listing were filed with the specification. The sequence listing stated that 4309 sequences were contained in the sequence listing and all were present. However, on 10/30/2002, the sequence listing was changed such that it now contains 7669 sequences. This submission adds new matter to the specification. Although it appears that the 7669 sequences appear to refer to the 7669 sequences disclosed in table 1, as also noted previously, the specification is missing pages 105 and 124, which would be found in table 1. These pages were replaced with duplicates of pages 191 and 188 respectively, which do not provide for the missing sequences, namely SEQ ID NOS: 3344-3360 or 4573-4642. Accordingly, it appears that the submission of 10/30/2002 has introduced new matter into the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 1634

6. Claims 1-22, 37-41, and 76-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The claims are drawn to a method of identifying individuals with a polymorphism and to methods of screening subjects for genetic markers associated with drug metabolizing enzymes, by detecting the presence of at least one polymorphism in any one of SEQ ID NOS 7063, 7064, 7071, 7073, and 7074. The claims are further drawn to a method of prescribing a drug or treatment protocol by detecting the presence of at least one polymorphism in any one of SEQ ID NOS 7063, 7064, 7071, 7073, 7074 and prescribing a drug or treatment protocol based on the result of the detection assay and further providing a prognosis to the subject based on the presence or absence of the polymorphism. Such methods are not supported by either a specific or substantial utility for the following reasons.

The specification asserts that determining DNA sequence variations in the human genome is useful for making accurate diagnoses, finding suitable therapies, and for understanding the relationship between genome variations and environmental factors in the pathogenesis of diseases, the prevalence of conditions and the efficacy of therapies (page 1). The specification teaches that the invention identifies genetic polymorphisms relating to genes encoding enzymes associated with drug metabolism (page 3 and table 1). The specification teaches that these polymorphisms are either in coding regions and may affect function or activity of the enzyme, or in non coding regions which may alter the expression of the enzyme or the processing of an RNA transcript encoding the enzyme (page 3). However, such uses are general to any SNPs found in any drug metabolizing enzyme, and are not specific or substantial with

Art Unit: 1634

regard to the instantly claimed SNPs. The specification does not teach which drug or treatment protocol would be affected by the instantly claimed polymorphisms, nor which diseases would be treated with regard to the presence or absence of such polymorphisms. While the claimed polymorphisms occur outside coding regions of CYP1B1, the specification does not teach or demonstrate whether such polymorphisms occur in 'regulatory' sequences of the gene, ie the promoter (for 5' flanking polymorphisms), or if they are in the gene at all. Additionally, the specification does not teach what the effect of such polymorphisms have on the activity, function, or expression of CYP1B1 RNA or enzyme, what, if any, effect such polymorphisms would have on a patient's response to therapy, or a patient's prognosis. At page 202, the specification shows an example of using SNP data in the thiopurine S-methyltransferase gene to correlate SNP genotypes and optimal amounts of a medicament for treatment validity and safety, however such enzyme provides no correlative information as to the usefulness of the SNP data for the CYP1B1 gene. While some polymorphisms would be expected to affect the activity, function or expression of the large number of genes genotyped in table 1, a large number would be expected to have no effect, especially when analyzed as a single polymorphism (that is no haplotype analysis). However, the specification provides no information to determine which polymorphisms will have an effect. Further, even assuming that some polymorphisms would have an effect, the specification provides no information as to how to use the SNP information for CYP1B1 to use the effect in prescribing drug or treatment protocol for a subject or providing any prognosis. At pages 196-198, the specification teaches generally that the SNP information can be used to evaluate drugs and to indicate the safety and effectiveness of drugs and briefly teaches how some screening can be achieved, however the specification provides no information

Art Unit: 1634

or assessment as to the effect, if any, of the polymorphisms for CYP1B1, let alone the claimed polymorphisms, nor how one of skill could use such information, for example in prescribing drug or treatment protocol for a subject or providing patient prognosis.

There is a large body of knowledge in the prior art related to polymorphisms in general, and their association with diseases or disease states, as well as drug or therapeutic response. However, the art is highly unpredictable with regard to the functionality of polymorphic sites in genomic DNA. After a screening assay identifies polymorphisms, it is unpredictable whether any such polymorphisms would be associated with any phenotypic trait, such as a disease state, a physiological state, or drug metabolism or response. For example, Hacker et al. teaches that they were unable to confirm an association between a gene polymorphism and ulcerative colitis in a case where prior studies suggested such a relationship would exist since the relationship had been identified in a different population (Gut, 1997, Vol. 40, pages 623-627). Even in cases where an association between a particular gene and a disease state is known to exist, such as with the LPL gene and heart disease risk or the p-globin gene and sickle cell anemia, researchers have found that when using SNP (single nucleotide polymorphism analysis) it was difficult to associate SNPs with disease states or to even identify key genes as being associated with disease (Pennisi, Science, 1998; 281 (5384):1787-1789). The unpredictability of the functionality or use of SNPs is not limited to diagnostic uses, but is found in drug response as well. Malhotra et al (Am. J. Of Psychiatry, vol. 161, pages 780-796, May 2004) teaches that while a T102C polymorphisms in the serotonin 5-HT<sub>2A</sub> gene was reported to have a significant association with the failure to respond to clozapine in 149 patients with chronic schizophrenia, such effect was not able to be replicated in a series of subsequent studies (see page 7829 col 2). Malhotra et al



Art Unit: 1634

teach that definitive studies in larger group sizes, prospective clinical data, and comprehensive analysis of the gene will be needed to further address the role of this gene in antipsychotic drug response (see page 783, col. 1). In the instant case, the specification only provides information that the variant exists, but provides no guidance that it has any effect whatsoever on the CYP1B1 gene, expression, or activity, let alone any potential diagnostic or therapeutic effect.

The research contemplated by applicant(s) to characterize polymorphisms in drug metabolizing enzymes and to determine potential drug or therapeutic protocols, or patient prognosis, for unidentified diseases, does not constitute a specific and substantial utility. Identifying and studying the properties of a polymorphism itself or the mechanisms in which the polymorphism is involved does not define a "real world" context or use. Further experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to determine a use for the claimed polymorphisms. However, in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (1966), the court held that that an invention must have either an immediately apparent or fully disclosed "real world" utility. The court held that:

The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility. . . . [u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field. . . . a patent is not a hunting license. . . . [i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.

The instant claims are drawn to polymorphisms which have no identified activity or effect on the CYP1B1 enzyme. Until some actual and specific significance can be attributed to these polymorphisms, one of ordinary skill in the art would be required to perform additional experimentation in order to determine how to use the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1-22, 37-41, and 76-110 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirements and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors have been described by the court in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CA FC 1988). *Wands* states at page 1404,

“Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman*. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.”

The nature of the invention and the breadth of the claims:

The claims are drawn to a method of identifying individuals with a polymorphism and to methods of screening subjects for genetic markers associated with drug metabolizing enzymes, by detecting the presence of at least one polymorphism in any one of SEQ ID NOS 7063, 7064,

Art Unit: 1634

7071, 7073, and 7074. The claims are further drawn to a method of prescribing a drug or treatment protocol by detecting the presence of at least one polymorphism in any one of SEQ ID NOS 7063, 7064, 7071, 7073, 7074 and prescribing a drug or treatment protocol based on the result of the detection assay and further providing a prognosis to the subject based on the presence or absence of the polymorphism. However, the specification has not enabled one of skill in the art how to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

The amount of direction or guidance:

The specification teaches that determining DNA sequence variations in the human genome is useful for making accurate diagnoses, finding suitable therapies, and for understanding the relationship between genome variations and environmental factors in the pathogenesis of diseases, the prevalence of conditions and the efficacy of therapies (page 1). The specification teaches that the invention identifies genetic polymorphisms relating to genes encoding enzymes associated with drug metabolism (page 3 and table 1). The specification teaches that these polymorphisms are either in coding regions and may affect function or activity of the enzyme, or in non coding regions which may alter the expression of the enzyme or the processing of an RNA transcript encoding the enzyme (page 3). At table 1, the specification teaches that the polymorphisms in SEQ ID NOS 7063, 7064, occur in the 5' flanking region of a nucleic acid sequence encoding the CYP1B1 (a cytochrome P450) enzyme and that the polymorphisms in SEQ ID NOS 7071, 7073, and 7074 occur 3' of exon 3 (page 160). None of these polymorphisms occur in a coding region of the nucleic acid. The specification teaches that the "n" at position 21 of SEQ ID NOS 7073 and 7074 represents an "A" or a deletion at that

Art Unit: 1634

position. SEQ ID NO: 7071 represents a deletion of a "T" at position 21 of SEQ ID NO: 7070. SEQ ID NOS 7063 and 7064 possess a G/A or G/C polymorphism at position 21, respectively. It is noted that the specification does not teach the complete nucleic acid sequence encoding the CYP1B1 enzyme used for such analysis, therefore it is unclear as to which specific nucleotide in the gene such polymorphisms occur. Although, as stated previously, such polymorphisms occur outside coding regions, it is noted that it is unclear whether such polymorphisms occur in 'regulatory' sequences of the gene, ie the promoter (for 5' flanking polymorphisms), or if they are in the gene at all, but may be in genomic sequences flanking the CYP1B1 gene. Additionally, the specification does not teach what the effect of such polymorphisms has on the activity, function, or expression of CYP1B1 RNA or enzyme.

Presence and absence of working examples:

Apart from teaching that such polymorphisms were found by screening 48 unrelated people (page 199) the specification does not teach the effect, if any, that such polymorphisms might have on the activity, function, or expression of CYP1B1 RNA or enzyme. Further, the specification provides no working examples of any effect such polymorphisms would have on a patient's response to therapy, or a patient's prognosis, nor does the specification teach any examples of prescribing drug or treatment protocol, or establishing a patient's prognosis, based on whether or not someone had any of the claimed polymorphisms. At page 202, the specification shows an example of using SNP data in the thiopurine S-methyltransferase gene to correlate SNP genotypes and optimal amounts of a medicament for treatment validity and safety, however such enzyme provides absolutely no correlative information as to the usefulness of the

Art Unit: 1634

SNP data for the CYP1B1 gene. While some polymorphisms would be expected to affect the activity, function or expression of the large number of genes genotyped in table 1, a large number would be expected to have no effect, especially when analyzed as a single polymorphism (that is no haplotype analysis). However, the specification provides no information to determine which polymorphisms will have an effect. Further, even assuming that some polymorphisms would have an effect, the specification provides no information as to how to use the SNP information for CYP1B1 to use the effect in prescribing drug or treatment protocol for a subject or providing any prognosis. At pages 196-198, the specification teaches generally that the SNP information can be used to evaluate drugs and to indicate the safety and effectiveness of drugs and briefly teaches how some screening can be achieved, however the specification provides no information or assessment as to the effect, if any, of the polymorphisms for CYP1B1, let alone the claimed polymorphisms, nor how one of skill could use such information, for example in prescribing drug or treatment protocol for a subject or providing patient prognosis.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or unpredictability of the art:

Neither the pre nor the post filing date art provide any indication that any of the claimed polymorphisms have any effect on the activity or expression of the CYP1B1 enzyme, nor if or how the polymorphisms can be used to evaluate drug safety or effectiveness, nor how or if they can be used in prescribing drug or treatment protocol for a subject or providing patient prognosis. The claimed sequences, as noted previously, are in non-coding regions, however it is unclear if they are in the CYP1B1 gene at all. With regard to P450's, Sundberg teaches (Ingelman-Sundberg, M. hereinafter referred to as Sundberg; Naunyn-Schmiedeberg's Arch. Pharmacol.

Art Unit: 1634

2004; vol. 369, pages 89-104) teaches that the cytochrome P450s are responsible for about 75% of phase I dependent drug metabolism as well as for the metabolism of a large amount of dietary constituents and endogenous chemicals (see abstract). With regard to CYP1B1, Sundberg teaches that it might have a role in the metabolism of oxidized growth-effector molecules (see page 99). Sundberg teaches that seven common CYP1B1 alleles have been identified but that the role of these allelic variants for the metabolism of oestradiol and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons has been investigated with variable results (see page 99, para bridging cols 1 and 2). Sundberg further teaches that one might conclude from such data that none of these alleles would have any major importance with respect to altered function of CYP1B1 in vivo or in vitro. Downie (Downie et al; Current Pharmacogenetics, 2004, vol. 2, pages 243-254) teaches that specific inhibitors to CYP1B1 have been used to modulate the cytotoxic profile of a range of structurally diverse anti-cancer drugs with CYP1B1, but that despite the benefits of clinical inhibitors, further studies are required to establish whether CYP1B1 allelic variants would possess the same response as wild type CYP1B1 (see page 249, end of col 1-col 2). Therefore, while the post filing date art teaches of therapeutics with regard to CYP1B1, the art acknowledges that further studies are required to determine whether allelic variants of CYP1B1 would have the same response as wildtype. As already noted, neither the specification nor the art teach how or if the claimed polymorphisms have any effect on the expression or activity of CYP1B1. As these polymorphisms do not occur in any coding regions, nor is it clear if they occur in any regulatory region, one of skill in the art would not be able to predictably correlate any of the claimed polymorphisms with altered or maintained expression or activity of CYP1B1 to be able to use

Art Unit: 1634

the polymorphism analysis let alone in prescribing drug or treatment protocol for a subject or providing patient prognosis.

There is a large body of knowledge in the prior art related to polymorphisms in general, and their association with diseases or disease states, as well as drug or therapeutic response. However, the art is highly unpredictable with regard to the functionality of polymorphic sites in genomic DNA. After a screening assay identifies polymorphisms, it is unpredictable whether any such polymorphisms would be associated with any phenotypic trait, such as a disease state, a physiological state, or drug metabolism or response. For example, Hacker et al. teaches that they were unable to confirm an association between a gene polymorphism and ulcerative colitis in a case where prior studies suggested such a relationship would exist since the relationship had been identified in a different population (Gut, 1997, Vol. 40, pages 623-627). Even in cases where an association between a particular gene and a disease state is known to exist, such as with the LPL gene and heart disease risk or the p-globin gene and sickle cell anemia, researchers have found that when using SNP (single nucleotide polymorphism analysis) it was difficult to associate SNPs with disease states or to even identify key genes as being associated with disease (Pennisi, Science, 1998; 281 (5384):1787-1789). The unpredictability of the functionality or use of SNPs is not limited to diagnostic uses, but is found in drug response as well. Malhotra et al (Am. J. Of Psychiatry, vol. 161, pages 780-796, May 2004) teaches that while a T102C polymorphisms in the serotonin 5-HT<sub>2A</sub> gene was reported to have a significant association with the failure to respond to clozapine in 149 patients with chronic schizophrenia, such effect was not able to be replicated in a series of subsequent studies (see page 7829 col 2). Malhotra et al teach that definitive studies in larger group sizes, prospective clinical data, and comprehensive

Art Unit: 1634

analysis of the gene will be needed to further address the role of this gene in antipsychotic drug response (see page 783, col. 1). In the instant case, the specification only provides information that the variant exists, but provides no guidance that it has any effect whatsoever on the CYP1B1 gene, expression, or activity, let alone any potential diagnostic or therapeutic effect.

The level of skill in the art:

The level of skill in the art is deemed to be high.

The quantity of experimentation necessary:

In the instant case, a large quantity of experimentation would be required to determine 1) a use for analysis which detected the claimed polymorphisms, and 2) in prescribing a drug or treatment protocol based on the result of the detection assay and further providing a prognosis to the subject based on the presence or absence of the polymorphisms. While a large quantity of experimentation is not itself necessarily undue, in the instant case, given the lack of guidance in the specification as to what effect the claimed polymorphisms have on the expression or activity of CYP1B1, the lack of guidance in the art with regard to the possible effect of these polymorphisms, the teachings of unpredictability in the art with regard to CYP1B1 polymorphisms, the teachings in the art that further research is required to determine whether allelic variants of CYP1B1 have the same effect as wild type with regard to clinical inhibitors (drug response or treatment protocol), as well as the teachings in the art with regard to the unpredictability of the effect of polymorphisms in general, such analysis would be replete with unpredictable trial and error analysis. To practice the invention as it is claimed, the skilled



Art Unit: 1634

artisan would have to determine the effect, if any, that such polymorphisms would have on the expression or activity of CYP1B1, and then to determine whether such an effect could be used to design a drug or treatment protocol and to determine if any prognosis could be made based on the presence or absence of such polymorphisms. While the level of skill in the art is high, based on the lack of guidance in the specification and the unpredictability taught in the art, the experimentation required of the skilled artisan is unpredictable and replete with an extremely large amount of trial and error analysis, requiring a large amount of inventive effort, with each of the many intervening steps, upon effective reduction to practice, not providing any guarantee of success in the succeeding steps. Thus given the broad claims in an art whose nature is identified as unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the large quantity of research required to define these unpredictable variables, the lack of guidance provided in the specification, the absence of working examples and the teachings of unpredictability in the art balanced *only* against the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to make and use the methods of the claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1634

10. Claims 1, 5, 12, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Han (Han et al WO 02/30951).

The claims are drawn to detecting any polymorphism in the sequences provided. The claim does not make clear which polymorphism is to be detected, or the identity of the polymorphism. The claims broadly encompass sequencing the CYP1B1 gene and surrounding region which Han teaches and sequences, (See Fig. 1). Such nucleic acid comprises the claimed SEQ ID NOS. Han teaches providing nucleic acid from the subject and detecting the presence of at least one polymorphism (determining the nucleotide at every position of SEQ ID NOS 7071, 7073 and 7074). Therefore, Han anticipates the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1634

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 1, 12, 37, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Accession number AC011074 (September 10, 2000).

The claims are drawn to detecting any polymorphism in the sequences provided. The claim does not make clear which polymorphism is to be detected, or the identity of the polymorphism. The claims broadly encompass sequencing the CYP1B1 gene and surrounding region which the Accession number teaches. Such nucleic acid comprises SEQ ID NO 7063, for example (see sequence alignment). Although the accession number does not specifically teach providing a nucleic acid from a subject or a detection assay, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to obtain nucleic acid from a subject as the accession number teaches that such DNA was sequenced from a homo sapiens genomic DNA sample.

### ***Conclusion***

14. No claims are allowable.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Jehanne Sitton whose telephone number is (571) 272-0752. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (571) 272-0745. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1634

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.



Jehanne Sitton  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1634

12/27/04